

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

KEITH L. NASH,

Plaintiff,

v.

DOUG WADDINGTON, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C06-5127 RJB/KLS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 156) of the Court's prior Order (Dkt. # 148), which denied Plaintiff's motion for counsel. Having carefully reviewed Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, the Court finds that it should be denied.

DISCUSSION

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and will ordinarily be denied in the "absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to the court's attention earlier with reasonable diligence." Local Rule CR 7(h)(1).

Plaintiff argues that reconsideration is necessary because this Court lacked jurisdiction to deny his motion and because the Court overlooked the fact that his Amended Complaint contains

1 claims in addition to denial of access and wrongful infraction mentioned in the Court's Order
2 denying counsel, which require the assistance of counsel. (Dkt. # 148). The Court has addressed
3 Plaintiff's position regarding this Court's jurisdiction on numerous occasions and found it to be
4 without merit.

5 The Court is also aware that Plaintiff claims that Defendants engaged in acts of retaliation,
6 conspiracy, harassment, and infringement. However, this does not change the Court's initial
7 analysis that Plaintiff has been able to adequately articulate his claims, and engage in extensive
8 motions practice and discovery, all without the assistance of counsel in this case. (Dkt. 148 at 2).

9 Plaintiff also filed Objections to this Court's Order (Dkt. # 159). Plaintiff objected on the
10 grounds that this Court overlooked evidence that Plaintiff was inarticulate, that he had demonstrated
11 exceptional circumstances warranting the appointment of counsel, and that this Court lacked
12 jurisdiction to enter the Order. (*Id.* at 3-4). On August 27, 2007, District Judge Robert J. Bryan
13 entered an Order overruling Plaintiff's objections and affirming this Court's Order denying
14 Plaintiff's motion for counsel. (Dkt. # 162).

15 Plaintiff has identified no error in this Court's Order, nor presented any new facts or legal
16 authority that suggest reconsideration is appropriate.

17 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 156) is **DENIED**.

18
19 DATED this 4th day of September, 2007.

20
21 

22 Karen L. Strombom
23 United States Magistrate Judge
24
25
26